

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-24 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 12 and 20 being the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 12 and 20 are sought to be amended. Claims 13 and 15 remain canceled. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,594,682 (hereinafter referred to as "Peterson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,732,282 (hereinafter referred to as "Provino"). Regarding claims 6 and 8, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to encrypt both streaming and stored media content in order to limit access to said content to authorized viewers, and likewise it is well known in the art for content receivers to include decryption means to decrypt encrypted media content when appropriate, for the purpose of permitting authorized users to enjoy encrypted content. Regarding claims 7 and 9, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to store and stream multimedia data in compressed form, and to decompress said data

*Attorney Docket No.: 42P10860*

**Appln. Serial No. 09/823,400**  
**Reply to Final Office Action mailed on August 10, 2006**

for viewing, for the purpose of minimizing required storage space and transmission bandwidth. Regarding claims 10, 11, 18 and 19, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to replace or update an application program in a computing device for the purpose of upgrading older software to a newer, improved version. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to claims 1-12, 14 and 16-24 since Peterson, Provino and the Official Notices, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 1, 12 and 20 for at least the following reason.

The Examiner added Provino to reject the claims and stating that Provino discloses first and second modules (virtual device drivers, fig. 2) that register with an operating system (21, fig. 2) by informing the operating system of their respective calling information (col. 3, ll. 15-39), thereby enabling applications to access and receive the appropriate hardware services (col. 3, ll. 3-8, col. 1, ll. 19-26). Applicant disagrees with the Examiner that Provino discloses first and second modules that register with an operating system. Applicant asserts that Provino discloses that virtual device drivers register with a registry 20, where the registry itself is constructed as a virtual device driver (see, e.g., col. 3, ll. 23-26 and Figure 2). The registry 20 is different from the operating system 21 (see, e.g., Figure 2). Provino further discloses that, after registering with the registry 20, the virtual device drivers are available for call by calling programs (see, e.g., col. 3, ll. 27-29). Thus, various calling programs access the registry to obtain information from the registry (see, e.g., col. 3, ll. 31-33). This is different from the present claimed invention, where the first and second content managers register with a coordinator by informing the coordinator of their respective digital data types and the coordinator invokes either the first or second content manager depending on the

**Appln. Serial No. 09/823,400  
Reply to Final Office Action mailed on August 10, 2006**

digital data type of the selected content. Accordingly, Peterson, Provino and the Official Notices, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 12 and 20 (and their dependent claims 2-11, 14, 16-19 and 21-24) are patentable over Peterson, Provino and the Official Notices, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: 09/26/2006

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126  
Molly A. McCall  
(703) 633-3311

P10860 Second Reply to Final OA

*Attorney Docket No.: 42P10860*